

# Riley County Vision 2025 Committee Meeting

September 21, 2006  
7:30 – 9:30 p.m. Denison Fire Station

## Meeting Summary

### Welcome & Introductions

- The meeting was called to order by the facilitator. The facilitator (Terrie McCants) and recorder (David Procter) introductions were made and roles explained.
- Jennifer Wilson was introduced from K-State Research & Extension, serving as neutral technical support for the process.
- County Commissioner Mike Kearns was introduced and thanked both the committee members and public for their commitment.
- Vision 2025 Committee Members introduced themselves and affiliation if applicable.
- The general public in attendance were acknowledged and asked to sign in on the sheet provided. They were asked to participate by observing the process and actions of the Vision 2025 Committee for Riley County, and invited to write down any comments, suggestions, or questions they might have and turn them in before leaving.
- The following ground rules were adopted for effective deliberation:
  1. Everyone is encouraged to participate.
  2. Every idea and comment is valid (*keep an open mind*).
  3. One person talks at a time.
  4. People need not agree. (*Please contribute thoughtful exchange*).
  5. No lectures, please limit comments to 2 minutes (*monitor your participation*).
  6. All decisions are recommendations only, subject to approval by the Riley County Commissioners.
  7. Agenda times are flexible, we will get as far as we get.
  8. Stay conscious!

### Agenda & Charge Review

- The meeting's agenda was reviewed and adopted with no additions/deletions. Items included:
  1. clarifying the purpose of this gathering,
  2. reviewing the background and general history that led to organizing this committee and its functions,
  3. breaking out into small groups in order to discuss individual concerns,
  4. looking at some possible options for ways in which to carry out the committee's charge and then by consensus select the strategy that will be used, and finally,

5. making some decisions about the leadership and operating logistics for future meetings.
- The charge to the committee was reviewed:
    1. Examine the relationship between private property and the furtherance of the public health, safety, and general welfare;
    2. Determine the appropriate balance of private property rights and the public good and develop principles that will be used to make decisions regarding future land use in Riley County;
    3. Using these principles, make specific recommendations to the Riley County Planning Board and the Board of County Commissioners regarding the following:
      - a. Goals and objectives for future land use in Riley County considering the recent VISION 2025 survey results and other pertinent information;
      - b. The proper mix (i.e. amount and location, etc.) of land uses in the rural areas over the next 20 years; and,
      - c. Zoning and subdivision regulation changes and other implementation strategies needed to accomplish the determinations made above.

### **Context & Background**

- Monty Wedel, Director of Planning & Development, was introduced and provided a brief PowerPoint presentation on the history of planning and zoning in Riley County and some of the issues/reasons why the Committee was created.

### **Small Group Discussions**

- Committee members were randomly assigned to tables and asked to break down into small groups (tables) to discuss the following question:
  1. How does the issue [private property rights and public interests in land use] impact you, your business, and/or your organization?
  2. Each table group captured the various perspectives and ideas represented and reported back summary to the full group.

The summary of the various perspectives/ideas is attached for reference.

### **Options for Resource Strategies**

- Modified consensus – where the group members each agree upon a decision that all can support or at least “live with” – was adopted as the form of decision making for the committee.
- Two options were presented as possible process for the group. “A” focused on first examining some broad concepts and values pertaining to the property rights & public good topic from which specific recommendations could then be generated. “B” focused on first looking at specific facts and possible implications from which general themes and patterns would be generated, and recommendations would address those. A blended option was adopted:
  1. Committee members would be provided current copies of the comprehensive land use plan.
  2. Parts of the existing comprehensive land use plan would be identified

- as needing additional considerations.
3. Committee will make recommendations to improve the existing land use plan and create a draft document.
  4. The draft document of committee recommendations will be presented to the public for feedback.
  5. Public feedback will be documented and serve as data for modifications and final recommendations from the committee to the county commission.
  6. Final recommendations will be forward to the county commission for decisions.

### **Logistics**

- Committee requested future meetings also be facilitated by outside parties. Formal committee leadership was postponed.
- At least monthly, two-hour sessions on Thursdays beginning at 7:30 p.m. were agreed upon. The next possible meeting dates considered were Oct 12 or Oct 19.
- Requested information [education] was identified to send out to committee members prior to the next meeting.

**Adjourned** at 9:32p

## **Riley County Land Use Meeting 09/21/06**

### **How does this issue impact you, your business, and/or your organization?**

#### **Group 1**

- Want growth; but controlled
- Ag needs protection
- Infrastructure
- 20 acre issue difficult
- Direction; certainty
- Property rights and protection
- Zoning sig. impacts prop.

#### **Group 2**

- School district base (# of students effecting budget)
- Higher property values
- Ag ability to function as efficiently and profitability
- Growth of communities (large and small)
- 20A provision is taking land out of Ag in an unplanned fashion (must deal with this)
- Burden of regulations vs. incentives
- Burden of regulation vs. individual property rights
- Balancing regulation, property rights and integrity of the land

#### **Group 3**

- Limited amount of Prime farm land....River bottom, Zeandale, Ashland, Wildcat Creek bottoms
- 20-40 acres – hard to farm and ranch around burning, spraying, general ag practices – hunting – houses too close
- Increased absentee ownership – lots of various sizes
- Where's the university going with their land use

#### **Group 4**

- Site size 20 acre
- Smaller consolidated and denser areas – with larger open areas around them
- Townships – means less roads, less rural water, less area for fire protection, better police protection
- Cluster development
- Conflicts between Ag and residential
- Resolve with bldg. permit
- Dust-odors noise
- Farming at night
- Right to farm
- Hold harmless

Group 5

- Township. Road access to development – levy taxes to support, build on roads only – rest inaccessible
- Conservation list. 20 acres – not maintaining/managing (cedars) growth or soil erosion
- Farmer. Driving up land property values and taxes
- Sand and gravel (stone). (both nat'l resources that need extracted).  
Riley Co. has adequate supply for now. Need land use plan to create buffer for extraction of (like quarry and sand, asphalt, concrete plants). Need buffer zones – with regard for geology of the land
- School district. Decisions to urbanize should include school needs i.e., how choose to use land impacts schools and public services
- Realtors. 20-acre sites – how land values impacted
- Citizens. Rural subdivision regulations to develop lot size min, sq. ft., frontage development, housing conflicts w/farm uses, set min. standards for housing